

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2001/08/07 : CIA-RDP80-01826R001100100053-5

~~SECRET~~
EYES ONLY

31 MAR 1964

25X1A

MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. [REDACTED] Office of the Inspector General
SUBJECT : Overseas Candidate Review Panel

1. The following information is submitted per your memoranda of 2 March and 12 March 1964:

a. The Overseas Candidate Review Panel was established to coordinate and evaluate information relating to suitability for overseas assignment of both Agency employees and their dependents. The procedures which the Panel follows are contained in [REDACTED]. During fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964 to date, the Panel considered the cases of 129 employees proposed for overseas assignment. Of these, the Panel recommended that 22 should not go overseas. Of those 22 employees, 17 were not assigned overseas and of the five (5) who were assigned contrary to the Panel's recommendation, two (2) were returned to Headquarters before the completion of their tours.

25X1A

b. Although under current Panel procedures staff employees and dependents are carefully screened before being sent overseas, a few employees must nevertheless be returned to Headquarters each year for disciplinary or suitability reasons. Our records indicate that 50 staff employees were returned to Headquarters prior to the completion of their tours for such reasons in calendar years 1962, 1963, and 1964 to date. In addition, four staff agents have been returned to Headquarters since 1 January 1963. Of the 50 staff employees who were returned, approximately one-half subsequently resigned. Those employees who have remained with the Agency are serving or have served probationary periods, are permanently restricted to Headquarters, are undergoing medical treatment or have been reassigned to other components where overseas duty is not a requirement.

c. We are of the opinion that improvement in our methods of screening candidates for overseas assignments is imperative. Additional minor changes in the modus operandi of the Panel can be considered, but changes on the part of the Panel cannot alone produce the desired results. Leaving the Panel for further discussion in the following paragraph, I would emphasize the importance that should be attached to the initial selection of overseas candidates on the part of area divisions and branches and other Agency officials selecting individuals for overseas assignment. Such officials must be fully aware of the importance of choosing individuals for overseas assignment who are not only technically

DOC	27	REV DATE	23/04/82	BY	102877
ORIG COMP	5	ORIG CLASS	5	PAGES	5
JUST	22	NEXT REV	20/2	AUTH:	HR 10-2

~~SECRET~~
EYES ONLY

GROUP 1
Excluded from automatic
downgrading and
declassification

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2001/08/07 : CIA-RDP80-01826R001100100053-5

~~SECRET~~ CONFIDENTIAL
EYES ONLY

SUBJECT: Overseas Candidate Review Panel

qualified to do the job, but who also possess the necessary emotional stability, the necessary physical health, and, if married, present a family situation that is sufficiently stable and wholesome to meet Agency requirements. It is believed that this is a matter of continuing education, which can be furthered through supervisory channels and also in Agency supervisory training courses.

d. The Overseas Candidate Review Panel is a screening mechanism which can be expected to remove from consideration only fairly obvious cases of unsuitability. Through an evolutionary process, the jurisdiction of the Overseas Panel has been broadened in the course of its history to include proposed PCS assignments of most of the Agency personnel whose cases can securely be subjected to this type of review. With a few possible exceptions, I do not consider it feasible at this time to broaden the Panel's jurisdiction to include cases of contract employees, contract agents, consultants, or project personnel. The most likely category to be added in my opinion would be career agents.

e. A logical extension of the Panel's jurisdiction, which could be implemented without great difficulty and which would help avoid problem situations which arise from time to time, would require the Panel to approve all lateral transfers or reassignments from one field station to another prior to the actual physical movement of the employee. Another logical extension would require that all proposed temporary duty assignments be cleared with the Panel whenever time permits. As a practical measure, this could be limited to TDY assignments which are expected to continue for a minimum of 60-90 days.

f. With respect to your point on our post-mortem operations, either this Staff or the Panel has for some time conducted a review in each case in which an employee has been returned from overseas for suitability or disciplinary reasons. This post-mortem may be an integral part of reviewing a particular case with a view to taking appropriate administrative action, or it may be solely for the purpose of determining if the problem could somehow have been avoided through more thorough screening techniques. This Staff and/or the Overseas Panel did a post-mortem on the DD/P cases listed in the attachment to your 12 March memorandum, except the following:

~~SECRET~~ CONFIDENTIAL
EYES ONLY

GROUP 1
Excluded from automatic
downgrading and
declassification

~~SECRET~~
EYES ONLY
CONFIDENTIAL

SUBJECT: Overseas Candidate Review Panel

25X1A



- Career Agent
- Career Agent
- Career Agent
- Returned for medical reasons and currently assigned to FE Division
- Returned to Headquarters due to unsatisfactory conduct and currently assigned to EE Division

Staff Agent, returned to Headquarters due to unsatisfactory performance--case is now being considered by the Agent Panel

2. If you agree, we are prepared to explore the feasibility of initiating the changes referred to in paragraphs 1.d. and 1.e. above. We continue to believe that improvement in this area is an evolutionary process, and to a considerable extent an educational process. In regard to your point as to the advisability of presenting cases in which the Panel recommends against overseas assignment to the appropriate Deputy Director, this is in effect the procedure established by the existing Regulation, although in practice a negative recommendation may be taken up directly with the area division or branch. I would agree with your suggestion that it would be desirable to present such cases either to the Deputy Director concerned, or to some other senior official in the Career Service, and not to the echelon which proposed the assignment in the first place. As to your point in your 12 March memorandum relating to the responsibilities of supervisors in cases of inappropriate overseas assignments, it appears obvious that the Agency will arrive at a reasonably mature situation in this area only when all individuals who play a role in such matters are obliged to assume full responsibility for their actions. The question of what specifically should be done in a particular case would, of course, depend on the facts in the case, and more particularly on whether the supervisor's action was prudent or wise in terms of the situation that existed at the time the decision to assign was made. If, on the basis of a thorough review, it appeared that the supervisor did not fully discharge his responsibility or have sufficient regard for the Agency's interests, it would then appear that some corrective action should be taken. In instructing the Overseas Panel to post-mortem a particular case, it is my intention to ask the Panel to address itself to this particular aspect.

25X1A

Distribution:

O&1 - Addressee

1 - D/Pers w/refs att'd

3 - C/SAS/OP

OP/SAS:

1a (31 Mar 64)

Chief, Special Activities Staff
Office of Personnel

25X1A

~~SECRET~~
CONFIDENTIAL

EYES ONLY

